

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 2 were previously cancelled. Claims 3-5 are hereby cancelled. New claims 6-8 are pending.

New claims 6-8 are presented herein to replace previously pending claims 3-5. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of these claims in light of the following remarks.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The amendments to claim 3 presented in applicant's preceding response were objected to for having omitted claim language presented without strike-through mark-up and for including mark-ups from previous responses of September 2004 and March 2005.

Claims 3 was also rejected for reciting "an MSC" rather than "a MSC".

Claims 3-5 are hereby cancelled in favor of newly presented claims 6-8. Therefore, the noted objections are believed to be avoided.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Houde et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,978,678) and Hammer et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0166403). Claim 4 was rejected as being obvious in view of Houde et al., Hammer et al. and Koster (U.S. Pat. 6,259,914 B1).

Newly presented claim 6 recites a method of providing a wireless communication service to an international roaming mobile station in which once an international roaming mobile station is registered at a MSC, the MSC receives a routing request message, determines whether the routing request message is for an international call, and if so further generates an international routing number for the international roaming mobile station, and assigns it a virtual origination number when a call origination request is received.

The stated invention is not believed to be taught by the combination of Houde et al., Hammer et al. and Koster primarily because the combination fails to disclose that the MSC is responsible for assigning a virtual origination number to the international roaming mobile station.

Contrary to the Patent Office comments with regard to now cancelled claim 4 on page 6 of the afore-mentioned Office action, the MSC disclosed in the Koster patent (and the other two cited patents) does not assign a virtual origination number to the international mobile station. Rather, in Koster, this is done by the IRS HLR 160. The Examiner's attention is directed to col. 6, lines 8-17. This passage is repeated below for convenience:

In step 314 the IRS HLR 160 returns an acknowledgment to the MSC 110. The acknowledgment includes a NANP-formatted Mobile Directory Number ("MDN") for the MIN. The IRS HLR 160 selects the MDN from a pool of numbers allocated to serve international roamers. The MDN is now associated with the original MIN. The MSC 110 will use the MDN to populate the calling party number parameter for any calls from the foreign mobile station 100 within the visited cellular system 120.

The Patent Office has taken the position that the NANP-formatted Mobile Directory Number ("MDN") mentioned in the above passage reads on the "virtual origination number" originally recited in claim 4, and now recited in claim 6. This passage clearly states that it is the IRS HLR 160 that selects the MDN from a pool of numbers allocated to serve international roamers and associates it with the original Mobile Identification Number ("MIN"). Once the IRS HLR selects the MDN it returns it in an acknowledgement to the MSC 110. Upon receiving the already selected and associated MDN from the IRS HLR, and only then, the MSC merely populates the Calling Party Number field 515 of the Call Setup Request 510 (which the Patent Office says reads on the claimed "call connect message" of now claim 7) with the "MDN previously returned during registration by the IRS HLR 160" (col. 6, lines 36-38).

In other words, in Koster, the MSC simply takes the MDN assigned by the HLR and populates the required fields of the call setup request. The MSC does not perform the assigning function as required by new claim 6. The combined references cited by the Patent office thus fail to render obvious the invention of the claims as now presented. Accordingly, allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 8, which depend from claim 6 are patentable for the same reasons as discussed above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Houde et al., Hammer et al. and Koster is respectively requested. Since all objections and rejections have been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such a notice is solicited.

This response is accompanied by a Request for Continuation and a petition for time extension, the fees for which are noted in the accompanying documents to be charged to Deposit Account 17-0055. No other fees are believed to for consideration of this response, however, authorization is hereby given for any additional fees to be charged to that deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

JIN-HONG KIM

Dated November 20, 2006

By:



Steven J. Wietrzny  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No. 44,402  
Quarles & Brady LLP  
411 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4497  
Tel. No. (414) 277-5415